HOLBROOK LIBRARY
PACIFIC SCHOOL
OF RELIGION

CHRISTIAN NEWS-LETTER

Edited by JOHN LAWRENCE
for the CHRISTIAN FRONTIER COUNCIL

A VILLAGE AND THE WELFARE STATE
A. S. Cran

CHRISTIAN POLITICIANS?
A. C. MacIntyre

THE NEW VOLUME OF DE TOCQUEVILLE

MOSLEMS AND CHRISTIANS
A. H. Hourani

Published Quarterly - October 1953

CHRISTIAN NEWS-LETTER

Vol. 1, *No.* 4 *October* 1953

CONTENTS

FROM THE EDITOR 155
Europe and Ourselves; Partnership of Races; Inside Russia; Commercial Television.
A VILLAGE AND THE WELFARE STATE. A. S. Cran 163
THE TWO GREAT REVOLUTIONS. (Review article on de Tocqueville and E. H. Carr.) The Editor 168
FROM A FRONTIER COMMONPLACE BOOK 170
CHRISTIAN POLITICIANS? A. C. MacIntyre 171
FAMILY LAWYER, NEW STYLE. Hyacinthus 174
FRONTIER CHRONICLE 176
Crisis in the European University; The Ecumenical Institute; Preparations for Evanston; Church and Worker in France; The "Church and the World" Institute. Mark Gibbs.
MOSLEMS AND CHRISTIANS. A. H. Hourani 179
REBELLION OF YOUTH. Leslie Paul 187
FREEDOM AND ORDER IN FRANCE AND ENGLAND. J. P. Mayer 191
BOOK REVIEWS. By J. H. Oldham, N. Micklem, Elizabeth Feiling, Marris Murray, Ruth L. Douglass, The Editor ... 196
OUR CONTRIBUTORS 204

Subscription 10/6 *per annum. Special rate for full-time students and missionaries* 5/- *post free. Single copies available on request* 2/6 (*post free* 2/8).

Subscriptions to:
Oxley & Son (Windsor) Ltd.,
4 *High Street, Windsor.*

Editorial Correspondence:
24 *St. Leonard's Terrace,*
*London, S.W.*3.

The Christian Frontier Council, under whose auspices this journal is published, is a fellowship of 30 *or* 40 *lay men and women who hold responsible positions in secular life and have met regularly for the past eleven years to explore with each other the practical implications of their faith. They include members of all denominations. From time to time the Council forms specialised groups to deal with subjects such as politics, medicine or education. The Council does not seek publicity, but on appropriate occasions the substance of its discussions will be made known in this journal. The Editor is solely responsible for what is published in "Christian News-Letter".*

CHRISTIAN
NEWS-LETTER

From the Editor

The greatest and most dangerous gift which the English people have given to the world is a technique of human relations. In Parliament, in trade unions, in local government, in the City of London, in sports, in clubs, in fact in every organised activity we know just how to behave so that even rivalry and competition shall conduce to a common purpose.

But a technique which works so well tempts us to think that human relations are nothing but a technique. Our organisation works because we know where we are with each other. When we collide the contact is momentary and we glance off again like billiard balls at an angle which can be foreseen. The clash of parties and personalities in Parliament leads to a result which is broadly predictable and, some would say, a little dull; even trade unions and employers now conduct their warfare according to rules. The foundation of all this is basic good manners. We don't tread on each other's toes and we don't even shout and wave our arms like foreigners, for it is a part of our good manners not to show our feelings. And if for a moment emotion breaks through the shell of our most useful conventions, why then every feeling can be put back in its place by a well-bred joke.

The penalty for our restraint is that we sometimes fail to make human contact with each other. Billiard balls respect each other and are careful to bounce off each other at the correct angle; we are a little too like billiard balls. Consistency of conduct is useful to society, so we force ourselves to *behave* consistently whatever we feel like doing. But feelings which are not expressed may become atrophied.

Like the ancient Stoics and Epicureans we aim at *ataraxia*, freedom from disturbing emotions. How dull the Romans became when Stoicism got the upper hand among them, and how interesting

the Romans of the late Empire became after their conversion to Christianity! The English are the Romans of the modern world, but what kind of Romans? Late paganism made reason the basis of virtue and aimed at a noble detachment from the chances of the world, but Christianity makes love the basis of the good life and we are commanded to involve ourselves to the full in what happens to other people.

There is not yet a great revival of religious life among the English intelligentsia, but there is a great revival of interest in religion. If you doubt it, go into a second-hand bookshop and try to buy translations of some of the stiffer religious classics. There may be no immediate danger that this interest will degenerate into moralism, but just because the English are good at the externals they are never far from the danger of putting conduct in the place of faith, taking good behaviour for faith itself when it is in reality one of the fruits of faith. Catholic teaching has always condemned this, and the Reformation Fathers are, if possible, even more explicit in their condemnation. But Pelagianism is our characteristic national heresy and it springs from the natural tendency to judge of virtue by external tests.

That is one reason why we in England need to look clearly at phrases such as "moral rearmament". The witnesses do not always agree, but from time to time one hears wonderful tales of what the moral rearmament movement does in other countries, notably in India, and in bringing together people of different races. These stories may well be true of countries where the first need is to develop the Roman virtues, but in this country the priorities are reversed. Indeed, for us the slogan "Moral Disarmament" might be less dangerous than its opposite.

Each country has its own problems. As an Anglicised Irishman I claim to be reasonably impartial about intra-Britannic relations—even so I have not dared to express any opinion about the Scots or the Welsh—but I suspect that all "Western" peoples have the same kind of problem. For instance, the French do not turn the expression of emotion aside with a joke, but they do use logical wit to deflate ideas which threaten their intellectual or emotional security.

But there are peoples who have not submitted to the spiritual topiary of the West. To organise Russians can be like playing billiards with bulls eyes. To them we seem too well regulated to be quite human. And the Slavs are not alone in this view of us. A West African broadcasting to his own people about England said: "You sit in the train with lots of people all around. They never smile at you

and they certainly never talk to you unless it is absolutely necessary. But of course they are extremely polite. They just sit there with solemn and impersonal faces behind newspapers . . . You almost suspect they live on newspapers from the way they cling to them." And that is just where our politics break down. If we are silent in trains, it is for fear that we should annoy each other; forbearance is the basis of our social and political system, and impersonality in trains is a part of it. But our colonial policy is in danger precisely from its impersonality, not from lack of principle.

Europe and Ourselves

Recent events have conspired to make us content with our present state. In 1939 we were ready for utter destruction. Again in 1945 many of us foresaw great trials and great opportunities, but since then everything has passed off very quietly. There are storms outside, and we are often warned that our lives are insecure; and so they are; but for ourselves we are living halcyon days, and we do not listen to the warning voices.

But Frenchmen and Germans, Dutchmen and Italians cannot lull themselves into false security and in that respect their condition is more healthy than ours. That is why so many of the plays which hold the French public go straight to the heart of the human predicament. Some are by Christian authors, but sometimes pagans express the precariousness of human life with greater power. What contemporary Christian brings home the realities of judgment as Sartre does in "Huis Clos"? In France Sartre is already *vieux jeu*, but most of us have not got round to him yet. Even all-powerful America knows better than we do that this is a dangerous world. When shall we have an English musical like *Guys and Dolls*? Damon Runyon has given us better religious drama than many Christopher Frys.

In politics we have much to teach, but in life we have much to learn. We hesitate to associate ourselves with the political arrangements of Europe because we see clearly the political weaknesses of France and Germany. Our criticisms of our neighbours are certainly shrewd, but we fail to see that their troubles sometimes spring from a strong national character which is not prepared to sacrifice other human qualities to the political virtues. The paradox is put by Mr. Mayer when he writes elsewhere in this issue, "the instability of the French governmental structure is a result of the strength of the French national character, not of its weakness."

Partnership of Races

"Partnership" is the word now most commonly used for th association of many races in the British Commonwealth. Such word can do much good when they express or clarify a new objective, bu they are dangerous if they merely shroud an intractable problem i ambiguity. Not so long ago the word "trusteeship" seemed to expres the ethical content of the relation between races in the Britis Empire as it ought to be.

The crux of the change is that partners are in a general sort o way equals, whereas trustee and ward are not equal; but partnershi is a very flexible word. In trading and professional partnerships th rights of the partners differ very greatly according to the deed o partnership. No doubt partnerships between races must differ too with different circumstances, but there must be some limit to legitimat variation. Is it right, for instance, in a partnership of races, tha there should sometimes be a senior partner with special power as often happens in a business partnership? By the Statute of Wes minster the states which are partners in the British Commonwealt are strictly equal in status; there are no senior partners. But it is no clear how the principle of partnership should be applied in plura societies such as Malaya, Kenya or Tanganyika, in the Centra African Federation as a whole or in the various territories whic constitute that Federation. Who are the partners, the different race or the individuals who make up those races?

In some of these countries most of the Europeans, when they spea of partnership, think of themselves as senior partners; but Africar and indeed Asians in the same countries are likely to have the own ideas. In Tanganyika the new pattern is equality between th three chief groups, viz. Europeans, Asians and Africans as group but that is not the same as equality between the individuals who mak up these groups. A few Europeans and a few Asians are give as much weight as many Africans. Such an arrangement may we be justified on the ground that each group makes a vital contributio to the well-being of the territory and ought to have a correspondin constitutional weight regardless of numbers. But then it follows th if circumstances change so that the junior partners as a group beg to contribute to the partnership in proportion to their number the terms of the partnership must be altered accordingly. And in the meantime individual African or Asian schoolmasters, skille artisans, shopkeepers, bankers or priests can satisfactorily perfor

he duties of senior partners, is there any reason why they should not s individuals have the status of senior partners?

The phrase "racial partnership" will need continual reinterpretation nd this process will always be dangerous. We need a few simple uiding principles which we can hold on to, but nobody seems yet o know what these principles ought to be. Some good thinking bout African problems is being done, but we seem to need some igh-powered body to bring it all to a point.

It is our duty to make it clear where we stand in these matters. ut it is very easy for us in Britain to criticise other countries of ie Commonwealth, and before we do so we ought to make sure iat we know what we are talking about, and that we are putting our wn house in order. Many thousands of colonial students come here ith high hopes, but our treatment of them when they get here has ften made friendly and gifted young men into embittered nationalists. the last few years quite a large coloured population has come to ork in London, Liverpool, Manchester, Birmingham and Cardiff o mention only a few centres). These people are not often brought to the local life of the place where they live, and we risk reproducing ere some of the features of American racial segregation. Better lations are in the end a question of individual behaviour, and any churches are helping their members to see how they can help. ome addresses of church organisations working in this field are ven in a footnote.) But the problem is eminently one that ought be tackled by the Churches together. What are local Councils of hurches doing about the coloured people who live among us?

Inside Russia

Stalin's power was based on the organisation of the Communist irty and the Secret Police; and the C.P. was based on a section the industrial workers. The peasants did not provide the undation of Soviet power. They wanted to own their own land d to be left alone, but that was not Communism. The old upper isses were swept away, but Stalinism has created two potentially werful new groups, the officers of the Soviet Army and the ecutives and technicians of Soviet industry.

There are members of the Communist party and members of the pu in all these classes, but Marxist enthusiasm is confined to a allish minority—at any rate it is little manifested outside the rmal demonstrations of parades and meetings. When I was in ssia, I found plenty of patriotic enthusiasm which was loyal to the

Soviet Russian State, but that is not the same as enthusiasm fo Marxism. And the singular apathy shown by the Soviet public a the time of Stalin's death was hardly consistent with a widesprea enthusiasm for Stalinism.

Is the balance of forces changing? A gusty wind seems to blo a few straws backwards and forwards. General Zhukov's return t the Kremlin seemed to strengthen the army and it is fairly clear tha the army played a part in the downfall of Beria. But so far ther is nothing to suggest that this has lessened the power of the Ogp

What about the peasants? Tax concessions to peasants who se the produce of their private plots will certainly be popular and wi probably bring more food into the town markets. And it is sensibl to the point of being obvious to allow collective farms to profit fro increased efficiency as is now to be done. But these are no fundamental changes.

The Stalinist policy was to make farms as like factories as possibl and to turn peasants into a sort of factory workers. The high mar of this policy was the plan to pull down the existing villages an regroup the peasants into "agro-towns". This particular plan cam to nothing because of peasant opposition, but it was associated wit the name of Nikita Khrushchev, who is now the first secretary o the Communist Party, which makes him one of the two or thre most powerful men in the Soviet Union, whether or not he is als the brother-in-law of Malenkov. Khrushchev's recent report "con cerning measures for the future development of Russian agriculture (*Pravda,* 13 September) may be taken to show the general objective of the present rulers so far as the peasants are concerned.

The whole tone of the Khrushchev report suggests a determinatio to make crops grow by order from Moscow. For instance, th Soviet agricultural authorities are told that they are guilty of " conservative attitude against the use of progressive methods o growing potatoes and vegetables", and the Communist "party bodies are told that they "must stop not-interfering in the animal husbandr situation".

But whatever methods he may employ, Malenkov has staked hi reputation on providing the Soviet peoples with a greater abundanc of the good things of life within the next two or three years. An to do this he needs peace and a slackening of the arms race. That i one good thing which has come out of the last few months. An something which is even better is that many Western statesmen seer at last to be waking up to the fact that we cannot feel secure fro attack by the Russians unless they feel secure from us.

Obscuring the Issue

The appeal to abstract principles is confusing the current debate about the future of television. It is true that all monopolies are in danger of becoming slack, even the B.B.C. It is also true that there are dangers in commercial control of the various media of mass communication. General principles are not irrelevant, but a great deal depends on the circumstances in which they are to be applied, and these circumstances may change with the passage of time. The benefits of competition, which are real, will only be fully realised in a trade where efficient new entrants can make their way fairly easily, as for instance in the book trade. But commercial control does not automatically produce competition, and competition does not automatically produce variety.

Industries which need a great deal of capital tend to get concentrated in a few hands, witness the cinema industry and the British national daily press. Nearly everyone would agree that this is not a good thing, but most of us would say that, in the case of the press at any rate, limited competition between a few national dailies is much better than no competition at all. But that does not decide the general question. For instance, has commercial competition in the film industry worked out better than the B.B.C.'s monopoly of broadcasting? The dangers of competition are as real as its benefits.

It may well be that technical advance will in the end bring down the cost of running a television service and increase the number of programmes which can be broadcast at the same time to a point when it is as easy to start a new television business as a new publishing business. And if this happens, it may be that free competition would serve us better than the B.B.C.'s monopoly. But at the present stage of technical development we could not hope to have more than a very few commercial networks competing with each other and with the B.B.C., and an "oligopoly" can be worse than a monopoly. With commercial TV we should certainly get more talk about competition, but should we get more of the reality of competition? On my excursions into the broadcasting world I seem to find a good deal of healthy competition between different programmes, different regional services and different producers.

The B.B.C. is not a perfect model—among other things it tends naturally to complacency—but it is responsible and not unenterprising. Commercial TV might turn out to be a highly responsible business in this country, but there is more than a chance that it

might not.' And is it certain that commercial TV would be more enterprising or less complacent than the B.B.C? In the press, competition reigns supreme, but the leading articles of the papers with the largest circulation are often the most smug.

There is no case for introducing commercial TV now. This conclusion is not to be drawn from any abstract principles concerning monopoly, responsibility and competition, but from the facts of the case here and now. If in a few years these facts are altered, then the case should be reopened.

J. W. L.

The following are some of the organizations which are now serving overseas students in Britain:

CHURCH MISSIONARY SOCIETY, 6 Salisbury Square, E.C.4.
CHURCH OF SCOTLAND CHAPLAINS FOR OVERSEAS STUDENTS, 26 Buccleuch Place, Edinburgh, and 232 St. Vincent Street, Glasgow, C.2.
EAST AND WEST FRIENDSHIP COUNCIL, 103 Gower Street, London, W.C.1.
METHODIST INTERNATIONAL HOUSE, 4 Inverness Terrace, London, W.2.
ROMAN CATHOLIC COMMITTEE FOR OVERSEAS STUDENTS, 13 Devonshire Place, London, W.1.
SOCIETY OF FRIENDS, Friends' House, Euston Road, London, N.W.1.
SOCIETY FOR PROPAGATION OF THE GOSPEL, Tufton Street, London, S.W.1.
STUDENT MOVEMENT HOUSE, 103 Gower Street, London, W.C.1.
THE VICTORIA LEAGUE, 38 Chesham Place, London, S.W.1.
WORLD EVANGELICAL ALLIANCE, Alliance Club, 1 Bedford Place, London, W.C.1.
The Y.M.C.A. and the Y.W.C.A.

Our next issue.

The January number of the CHRISTIAN NEWS-LETTER will include articles by:

The Bishop of Bristol (Dr. F. A. Cockin) on Medical Ethics, Dr. Kathleen Bliss on Population and Hunger, and a review article by Professor C. A. Coulson on Religion and Science in the light of Canon Raven's Gifford Lectures.

Half Rate for Students and Missionaries.

We can now offer a special subscription rate of 5s. per annum post free for missionaries and *full-time* students at school or college. A gift form is enclosed.

A Frontier Luncheon Report

A Village and the Welfare State

A. S. Cran

A country parson examines the coming of the Welfare State in a Somerset village.

My village, Congresbury, is a village at a crossways where still tands the medieval market cross. Equidistant from the cross, and n either side, are the church and the village hall. The rest of the illage stretches out along four ways. The population of the village about 1,500.

The main activity of the people is farming. The land is very rich n grass, and the farmers for the most part are the owners of their oldings. They, with their sons and one, sometimes two, hired orkers living in tied cottages, work the farms. For the rest, two orn mills, a large mushroom farm, a sawmill and an agricultural ngineering shop, provide employment for the people of the village, ogether with the usual small shops and garage and the like. There employment at a small furniture factory in the neighbouring village nd, of course, Bristol is some twelve and Weston-super-Mare some ght miles away. The village hall is a War Memorial to the 1914-918 war, and it was raised by public subscription. It houses a men's ub, skittle alley and rifle range, and is the centre for the usual ances and whist drives, and the activities of the Women's Institute, nd the British Legion, and other parish social groups. We have so a King George V Memorial Playing Field, a bowling green on ie riverside, and seven public houses. The church has the active iembership of about one third of the population; there is a Methodist lhapel with some 70 members. Both Church and Chapel have active unday Schools. There is a voluntary controlled village school which, ith the Church, organizes semi-cultural activities like extension ctures, evening classes, and a dramatic group.

So here is a typical Somerset village, rather on the large side. Now you study such a village, you will notice the emergence of three stinct elements in it. First of all, there is what I call the "old llage"—farmers and the old leading families—and here you will nd there is an instinctive, if inarticulate, sense of community. They ant to be together and they want to do things together, and, although ey may grumble again and again that the village is nothing like it ed to be in the old days, if there is any communal activity taking ace they are very much to the forefont.

The second element is the urban incomer—the retired person wh likes to live in the country, the business man who travels to wor and the artisan who is not engaged directly in work on the lan At first, these people had a hard row to hoe in the village. The presence was resented and they were not welcome; but as time we on it was seen that they were bringing distinct economic benefits t the village as a whole, and gradually they took their places in th community. Their contribution was that of business people wit organizing ability. For instance, the Church owes a great deal to th capabilities of an Insurance Broker and an Accountant, both of who work outside the village.

The third element to be noticed, and to my mind the mo important and significant, is that of the agricultural worker—th beneficiary of the Welfare State. With better conditions and mo money in his pocket, he is coming into his own, so that there ope before him a wider field of enterprise for his hens and pigs, for h garden, and his orchard. His wife has more amenities in her hous indeed as water and electricity come to more and more houses, villag women are knowing what it is to have time on their hands.

Take these three distinctive elements of the village community– that of the "old village", the urban incomer, and agricultural worke and let us see how they affect typical village institutions.

The Farmer To-day

First of all, the farm. The farmer largely belongs to the "o village". He is today a very secure person. He is better off tha ever before. He tends to show his security either in putting mone back into his holding or into his house, or by just spending it vulgar in the pub, or on gambling and the like. But his security depen very much upon his relations with his labourers, and those relatio are strained at three points. There is strain over the hours of wor The farmers, as a whole, will not employ the extra man that wou make the hours of work agreeable to everybody concerned. The tend to make do with themselves and one hired man; so that arrang ment of free time is difficult, and you get the farm labourer wh insists on his day off and then, to spite his boss, puts in half a day work for another neighbouring farmer, or refuses to come in to d the milking on a Sunday. There is strain over the tied cottages, whic can be very bad cottages indeed and in some cases condemned. He the labourer feels he has a very real grievance. He tries very ha

to get out of his cottage into one of the Council houses and so become more independent of the farmer. The more progressive farmer will build his worker a modern house. The not so progressive farmer will grumble at his labourer's independent and "socialist" spirit. Again, there is strain over political activities. I know one farm worker—a very excellent man—who is continually on the move because he is said to be an agitator—that is, anxious to get his fellow-workers to join the Agricultural Workers' Union.

But the farmer is also affected by the urban incomer. Since the war a great Council house estate has been developed, and two farmers in the village have lost most of the worthwhile land they used to hold. They are only kept going by the kindness and help they receive from fellow farmers who let them pieces of grass and land. Farming, as a whole, is being influenced by the fact that there are coming to the farms men whose background is the town, and I should venture to say that the revival of the countryside is perhaps receiving most from some of these urban incomers who have learned the job of farming and are farming with responsibility and devotion. So much for the farm.

Now take the village hall. Six years ago there was a great agitation in the village about the administration of the village hall. The "old village" said it should be maintained in the old way, i.e. by a committee elected by people who subscribe to the hall. The new incomers said "No"—every organization in the village should be represented on the hall committee. A great public meeting was held, attended by some 400 villagers, and there was a terrific and lovely village row. The "old village" just won, but the issue today is as dead as a door nail. Why? Because on the various village committees you now have the agricultural worker rising up to take a prominent part in this work and neither the old village nor the new incomers know how he is going to use his new-found independence. Five years ago our Parish Council was composed solely of farmers and so-called lesser gentry. Today there is one corn miller, two farmers and nine villagers. In the neighbouring village, in an election for the Rural District Council, the squire had to give place to the village postman, and in our own village a farmer was actually defeated at the polls.

In the church, the division is between the "old village" and the urban element". The people from the town have enriched the life of the church in many ways, and I have to acknowledge the debt we owe to many people who have come to us from urban backgrounds. But the significant thing about the church is that here you

do not see the influence of the agricultural worker rising to any prominence. I am thankful to say he is in the church, and again and again he supports the urban elements against the old village, but he is not articulate by any means—nothing like so much as he is on his own job or in general village affairs. Where he does come into his own is in the school. We have a Parent-Teacher Association in the day school, and there the activity and the interest of the ordinary village worker himself, with his wife, is very great and very important.

Our Village and the Future

The village community of today is a rapidly changing community shedding much of its past, emerging to what as yet it does not really know, but in all this turmoil the determining factor is the agricultural worker and his artisan mate. He is coming into his own. The cinderella of the village has found, through the Welfare State, the magic slipper, but the slipper pinches at various places. It pinches at the labour conditions on the farm and the problems that the farmer has in respect of labour. The farmer again and again blames the State because he has to pay high wages, and he is always saying "Why should I kill myself to pay these high wages?"

And then again the shoe pinches in the commercial exploitation of the agricultural worker. The cheap and the vulgar and the shoddy are being brought with new money, into the houses of the people despite all the good work that is done by the Women's Institute. The dance hall in the town has a strong attraction for the young. Motor coach outings that get lost in the pubs have a great fascination for many.

Again, a large Council house estate has been put up (of necessity and to save money) in a large block on one side of the village, creating almost a separate and independent community where the people become Council house conscious. Instead of scattering the houses amongst the village so that the new element could be absorbed, the tendency is to isolate them; and there, indeed, the shoe does pinch.

Of course, the shoe pinches again in the so-called weaknesses of the Welfare State—love of ease, dislike of work, refusal to think or to accept responsibility. They are, of course, symptoms that have appeared in other classes before the establishment of the Welfare State, but I believe that the village has within itself the necessary correctives. There is still a tremendous enthusiasm for voluntary activity. All sorts of organizations spring up and struggle with real

vigour. Some of them die but none of them departs without having some useful influence upon the life of the village. We have in our village real family thought for those who are in trouble or in need, and practical and financial help is provided by their fellow villagers on an anonymous basis; that is a real and valuable service that goes on. Then, again, the corrective is to be found in that some of the old leaders of the village have the good sense to see that the best contribution they can make is to step down from the positions of authority and leadership they have held and to take their place in the community among the rank and file. Such "good villagers" win for themselves a new influence and an enhanced status in the village. There is still also in the countryside, despite counter attractions, the great corrective of vocation to the land, which shyly emerges from all sorts of places—from the Y.M.C.A. agricultural training schemes, from urban people who have turned out to be the most wonderful gardeners; and, although inarticulate, this vocation is very real in the lives of many a farmer and many a worker. Last of all, the life of the church is a quickening influence, and you should not let anyone persuade you that the work of the church is ineffective in the countryside. The village has real need of the church, which still serves to lift up the whole life of the community, and a great portion of the community is still concerned that that life should be lifted up in devotion to God and service to its neighbours.

The next Frontier Luncheon

ARE MARRIAGES MEANT TO LAST?

Dr. Gilbert Russell, the well-known broadcaster, who is speaking on marriage at the next Frontier Luncheon, is Vice-President of the National Marriage Council as well as a Harley Street doctor specialising in psychiatry. After studying medicine at Edinburgh and theology at Cambridge, Dr. Russell became Medical Secretary of the S.C.M. He has been a medical missionary in China, Vicar of St. Peter's, Harrow, and Education Secretary of the Church of England Moral Welfare Council. Since 1946 *he has been on the staff of the West End Hospital for nervous diseases. Dr. Russell is the author of "Men and Women" (S.C.M. Press,* 1948). *He is married and has four children.*

The Luncheon will be in the crypt of St. Martin-in-the-Fields at 12.45 *on Wednesday,* 11*th November. Tickets* (3*s.*) *should be obtained before* 9*th November from the "Christian Frontier",* 8 *The Cloisters, Windsor Castle.*

The Two Great Revolutions

The discovery of a lost masterpiece is exciting. Alexis de Tocqueville died while he was writing a study of the French Revolution which formed the natural climax to his life's work. A part of his material found its way (considerably edited) into posthumous editions, but the main body of Tocqueville's thought about the Revolution was supposed lost. Now, however, Mr. J. P. Mayer and his assistants have brought together into one volume the preparatory material left by de Tocqueville in its original form, and the result is startling.[1] De Tocqueville was near enough to the French Revolution to know many who took part in it, but he speaks the language of to-day. The English translation of what is in effect a new work will be awaited eagerly.

The essence of de Tocqueville's thought about each phase of the Revolution stands out clearly. Some chapters seem near to their final form, others are rough drafts and yet others are little more than jottings. But what jottings!

It is as if we could go into de Tocqueville's study and overhear him say "J'en doute", or, "try to find out what this nonsense means", as he reflects upon the pronouncements of Kant and Fichte about the "amazing conformity of the laws of pure thought and the instinctive *élan* of a nation in regeneration". If he had lived we should have had a more polished work and some tentative ideas would have been tested and developed; but we should have lost the Pascalian directness and simplicity of de Tocqueville's first thoughts. It is like the difference between Constable's sketches and his finished paintings.

Here are some typical examples of de Tocqueville's comments:

> "In the first days of a revolution the greatness of emotion always surpasses by far the greatness of events, while at the end it is far from reaching them."
>
> "If the interests" (of the different classes in 1788) "were different, their ideas were the same, all knew of politics only by what they had seen in books and in the same books."
>
> 1789. "Philosophical character that wanted a theory even for violence."
>
> "It is not the sea that saved England; it is her spirit, above all *liberty*. Grand spectacle, liberty alone capable of fighting the Revolution."
>
> "One overthrows a Government by raising the masses

[1] *L'Ancien regime et la Revolution.* Tome II, Vol. II, by Alexis de Tocqueville (Gallimard, 1953. 960 frs.).

against it with the help of certain words. One goes on saying the same more freely and still louder because one has become the Government. The noise one makes deafens one to the effect one is making; and when those who made such a loud noise are overthrown in their turn one is astonished to see that hardly anyone else was of their opinion."

"The last thing that a party gives up is its vocabulary . . . If one wishes to know the true power of the press, one must never attend to what it says but to how it is heard."

"Why did . . . similar theories only bring a change of Government in the United States and a total subversion of society in France?"

And finally a quotation which might be a text for Mr. Deutscher, whose book, *Russia After Stalin*, is reviewed on another page:

"At the beginning of a violent revolution the laws made in ordinary times are gentler than custom, which is suddenly made hard by new passions. But in what follows the laws end by being harder than custom which paralyses them with mildness."

De Tocqueville's greatness is well shown by a comparison with E. H. Carr's immensely able study of another Revolution[1].

In completing the first stage of his Gibbonian attempt to write a history of the Bolshevik Revolution, Professor Carr has already done an extraordinary feat. What was first planned as a long introductory chapter has grown into three stout volumes and at the present rate of progress we may expect that in about fifteen years we shall have twelve or twenty monumental volumes. Like Gibbon, Professor Carr can shape a vast mass of inert chronicles into an intelligible narrative, but he has not Gibbon's easy flow. So long as your mind is fresh, every page (or nearly every page) will give something good to think about, but if your attention flags you will soon find that you are reading without understanding a word.

Carr shows in an admirably concrete manner the interaction of ideas and events, of politics and economics, of social traditions, new aspirations and hard facts. His work will hardly be superseded until the Kremlin archives are opened. Divesting himself of Western prejudices, he enters into the thoughts of Russian Revolutionaries, but remains free from the self-imposed fetters of the Orthodox Marxist. He sees the problems of the administrator and the diplomatist very clearly and he is at his best in describing the terrifying contacts of the early

[1] *The Bolshevik Revolution* by E. H. Carr. (MacMillan, Vol. I. 25s.: Vol. II. 30s.; Vol. III, 35s.)

Bolsheviks with German big business and the Reichswehr. But he i blind to the worm's eye view and therefore he fails to convey the warr human realities which underlay the turnings of Soviet economic policy

He judges expediency with cool skill and impartiality, but mora issues have no place in his scheme of history. It is not that he judge wrongly, but his abstention from all judgment is itself a choice o neutrality, and there are situations where neutrality is wrong. More over, his realism does not go far enough, for it leaves out humar passions which are themselves an important part of reality.

De Tocqueville is always stopping to ask himself why men do such strange things, but Professor Carr describes the most extraordinary and dramatic events of modern history without looking up from the written sources. Carr sometimes gets bogged down in detail, but de Tocqueville always comes back to simple general principles. In this he surpasses even Thucydides. But the intellectual principle never obscures the human realities; as you read de Tocqueville you can never forget the doubts, the passions, the tragedies of the Revolution and you can never forget that politicians and those whom they rule are all human beings. It is often asked what should distinguish a Christian historian from a pagan. There is no simple and comprehensive answer but those things which distinguish de Tocqueville are closely connected with the fact that he was a Christian.

He penetrates deep into human motives, but he never explains away the mysteries of human behaviour. Describing how small men become the causes of great events, he concludes (half to himself): "I wonder at the power of God for whom such short levers suffice to set in motion the whole mass of human societies".

J. W. L.

FROM A FRONTIER COMMONPLACE BOOK

Triviality is often more perilous to the soul than wickedness; and if there is less wickedness to-day than in the past, there is more triviality. —*R. H. Tawney.*

God made the moon as well as the sun; and when he does not see fit to grant us the sunlight, he means us to guide our steps as well as we can by moonlight.—*Richard Whately.*

Order should only be broken by those who have learned gratefully to revere it.—*P. T. Forsyth.*

Christian Politicians?

By Alasdair C. MacIntyre

What a man is is shown by what he hopes and what he fears. It is part of the tragedy of contemporary man that his image is to be discerned in fears rather than in hope. Half the human race is condemned to simple basic fears: when will the next meal come? Will it come? And those who are sheltered from this question by their economic position have still the question: when will the next war come? Will it come? Behind these fears lie others, subtler but as distracting. There is the fear of not being free. To be free is to be oneself, to be able to say what one means instead of having to say what the government, the Politburo or Senator McCarthy means. To be free is to be responsible for what one says, to be committed to mean what one says. And so there is not only the fear of not being free, there is the fear of freedom, the fear of responsibility. Over all there is the simple anxiety of the future—

Here am I and here are you,
But what is it all about and what are we going to do?

Christ said: "Take no heed for the morrow, what ye shall eat or what ye shall drink . . . ". And the words comforted. The church repeats them. And the words have no comfort. For the consolation of the words lay not simply in what the words said, but in the fact that it was Christ who spoke them. Unless the church can make the words heard as Christ's words, the words themselves have no power. Hunger, atomic war, loss of freedom—what is the Gospels' answer to the questions which these words represent?

There can be no adequate answers to such questions which are not in part political answers. You cannot feed the hungry unless you can afford to buy wheat on the world market, unless you command the means to transport it, unless you have an administrative machine to organise the feeding and an executive to carry it out. You cannot quell the fear of atomic war unless you are prepared to quell the fears of Mr. Malenkov and Mr. Dulles. And while ballot-boxes and a free press are not the whole of freedom, they are a substantial part of it. But all these things are politics. Any gospel which has nothing to say about these things has nothing to say to modern man. Any gospel which omits them denies that God is Lord over political life, Lord over the whole life of man. So Christians are committed to political life.

To be committed to political life is to be committed to the us of power. There is no way of political change that does not involv the successful and effective use of power. You can mask it, lik Gandhi, or you can flaunt it, like Vyshinsky, but the fact remains to use power effectively in politics means to stand with one of th effective power-groups. No political doctrine that has not behind the power of money or of the masses or of the industrialists will eve achieve anything in the political realm. And no power-group is wholl altruistic. To be involved in politics is to be involved in the selfishnes of power, in the corruptions of power. Hence the Christian dilemm —no relevant gospel that is not a political gospel, but no politics tha does not involve the half-truths of propaganda and the injustices o successful power.

Faced with the dilemma Christendom has classically offered tw alternatives. On the one hand there is the pietist withdrawal fro political action, the political descendants of Tertullian who ask "What have Moscow and Washington to do with Jerusalem?" Th pietist equates the use of power with sin and offers us a gospel o redemption from the world of politics rather than one that redeem the political. To do this is to deny that Christ's saving work cover the political life of men, and to deny that is blasphemously to limi that work. Over against the pietist solution there is the Erastian

> And still the Church of England will decide
> That God is always on the English side.

This solution suggests that the gospel in its political expressio can be completely identified with the activities of some one power group, whether it be the British Empire, the so-called "free world" o even, as with some Christians behind the Iron Curtain, the Sovie Union. To do this is to confuse God's kingdom with an earthly rule worse still, it is to sanctify with the name of Christian, regimes whic whatever their formal adherence to the faith may lack all the mark of Christ's compassion. (Two governments in the world today whic are unequivocal in their church allegiance are those of Dr. Mala and General Franco.)

It seems that to ask for a Christian politics must bring one t despair. Yet it is at the point where we learn to despair that hope i born. For out of despair comes repentance, and out of repentanc hope. What the Christian immersed in political activity has to under take is to combine the effective political use of power with a cleansin repentance for the sin that is bound up with such a use. It is onl

a politics of repentance that can avoid the nemesis that follows upon both the sinful misuse of power and its equally sinful neglect. But what is it to repent in political terms? Repentance here means a willingness at every point to be open to one's own fallibility in general and to one's particular failings. This means that within the party and the power-group to which one is politically committed, the Christian will be particularly concerned with the failings of his own group rather than with that scape-goat of all politicians, the other side. But he can only allow himself such criticism of his group if his involvement in its political work, and in particular in its political chores, is such as to give him the right to it. As a politician, the Christian is involved in a perennial work of compromise and negotiation, of yielding this so as to gain that. But he can only undertake this repentantly if he is willing to admit that there are some points, perhaps not very many, where there can be no compromise. These points will not always be the same for everybody. The kind of pacifism that rejects war in principle is too often a pietist retreat, but the vocation of some of our contemporaries may be to say an absolute "No" to participation in atomic war, in order to witness to the fact that men were not created to treat each other in this kind of way. Hence Christian politics will take place on two levels: at the one, it will be a participation in the relative compromises of everyday political life, looking for small gains and improvements, witnessing to that continual redeeming of the time which is the hidden work of the Holy Spirit; at the other level, it will be an absolute regard to the reality of human community, whether in the witness of some Christians to the call to perfection by withdrawal into monastic and other communities or in the witness which all Christians are called to make against such mockeries of human community as *apartheid* or napalm bombs. (Whether all Christians agree about what the Christian witness on a particular point should be does not alter one jot what the authentic Christian witness is.)

The Christian politician waits not for Utopia but for the Day of Judgment. He lives by hope and hope is not to be confused with expectations based on prediction or with mere desire. The secular politician has to live by calculation. The Marxist with his attempt to make politics scientific is the supreme example of this. And if he is not able to calculate his success, the secular politician can only desire that somehow things will turn out right. To be a calculator, to trust in the number of one's battalions or the dialectic of history,

is to be one of the Stalins of politics. To be a wishful thinker, is to be one of the Neville Chamberlains. But the Christian knows that in every situation there is more to hope for than he or anyone else can possibly see, because in every situation there is God. Despair of himself is the first prerequisite of the Christian politician; never to despair of the world, because it is God's world, is the second.

Hope remains alive through prayer. In prayer, in the liturgy, we meet the absolute commands of God and the absolute fulfilment of those commands in the Community which He gives at the eucharist. In taking of the bread and the wine at the Lord's table we anticipate His final satisfaction of the world's hunger, we are made His body to share in His work of feeding the world. To pray is to make incarnate the grace that fulfils nature by drawing us to Him who made us, the grace that purifies nature by making us aware of the darkness which is within us. Behind all Christian politics lies the prayer of intercession which the Church makes for the world at the eucharist. What issues from that prayer in works of political love is the gift of God.

Family Lawyer, New Style

"No, no" said the family lawyer with a gleam of pleasure in his kindly old eyes. "A solicitor's life is far from dull. It isn't all leases and conveyances, you know. It's grand when one can help 'em", he added almost to himself.

Then he told us a story.

"It is many years ago now and I can tell you the story without indiscretion. It is a common enough tale, too."

A young woman had come to see him. There were two children. Her husband after many months of quarrelling had formed a liaison with another woman. It all seemed plain sailing.

But her story, even presented with skill, had tried his patience. The injured innocence, the wealth of unnecessary detail, the repetitions. "I could have smacked her," he said. "I told her I had found her so irritating in an hour that I could well imagine how her husband must feel."

So the client, I noted, is not always right.

The ice had been broken. She was no longer merely the innocent party. She was no longer even a case. She was a woman who needed help, and the help might save a marriage.

It took a year.

He saw her many times. He demanded her patience. He roused

her imagination. He made her laugh. He talked to her husband too. He told him exactly what he thought of him. Finally, he saw them together.

He told her in front of her husband that she was maddening, and he told her husband that he had been heartless. He told them both that they were fond of each other. Then he sent them away to think it over.

He heard no more of them until he had an invitation to a christening.

What more? I asked. What else had he said to his clients?

"Oh well," he said, "if you're interested, there was the case of the Chartered Accountant. I wonder what has happened to him."

The wife this time had been simple and easy-going. An accumulation of incidents had led her to seek divorce. Her husband did not understand, he was bored with her, was always criticising, supervising, trying to run her, making her do accounts.

Here the lawyer had seen the light. Of course the husband was a brilliant man, but he did not understand women. He brought his considerable powers of analysis to bear on his everyday life and expected satisfactory results. "All I said," the lawyer went on, "was 'For Heaven's sake give up treating your wife like a set of company accounts.' I found," he ended, "that it is usually the simple, perhaps trivial details of life that lead to these disasters. It is often so easy to help."

I got up to fetch the coffee with many thoughts. Another lawyer many years ago had not behaved as a human being, he had not taken on the role of a friend, ventured on the ground of a priest. He had never mentioned healing. No one had laughed.

He had talked of available evidence, of a good straight fight, of commencing proceedings, of a successful issue. And one more marriage had been lost.

HYACINTHUS.

The demand for *PATER NOSTER*, a meditation on the Lord's Prayer, first published as a supplement to the CHRISTIAN NEWS-LETTER in January 1941, is well maintained. Copies can be obtained from the "Christian Frontier", 8 The Cloisters, Windsor Castle. Single copies 3d. each; 2/- per dozen post free.

Frontier Chronicle

Crisis in the European University

It is a familiar half-truth that ecumenical discussions on Faith and Order are in danger of becoming an occupational disease of church dignitaries, that Lund is a long way from the parish congregations of Sunderland or Glasgow. In the same way, international conferences on Life and Work, on the Christian attitude to social and political questions, tend inevitably to involve professors rather than students, educationalists rather than class teachers, elderly experts more than beginners in public life. It is therefore particularly pleasant to be able to report on a conference which tackled a typical "frontier" question—the problems of the Christian student in his university—and which aimed at a genuinely European discussion at a not too exalted level.

The conference met on the island of Mainau, on Lake Constance, an unusual, indeed an extraordinary study centre. Schloss Mainau has for very many years been under Swedish ownership, and is now the property of Count Lennart Bernadotte, nephew of the late Count Fulke Bernadotte of the Red Cross. In 1946 the Swedish government and the French occupation authority gave grants to enable rather more than half of the building to be made into an international conference centre, under the auspices of the Worlds Y.M.C.A. Mainau is not, however, merely a private residence and a conference centre. A famous attraction for tourists, mainly because of its fine gardens and tropical plants, it receives 5,000 visitors each weekday and 15,000 on a fine Sunday. This army of extremely well mannered and tidy trippers is not allowed in the house, but their presence in the gardens and beneath the windows is an essential contribution to the island's exchequer.

In this beautiful and unusual setting some sixteen conferences are held each year, ranging in 1953 from a U.S. chaplains' course and a "Retreat for Booksellers" (sic) to an admirable practical course in psychology for public officials, which is said to have been inspired by the experience of the Swedish warden with local customs officials. Our conference was organised by the World's Student Christian Federation, and the lecturers included a professor from the Sorbonne, two English S.C.M. secretaries, and the late Vice-Chairman of the W.S.C.F. The members of the conference were all students from

European universities, mostly with some experience of Christian leadership. The British lecturers were determined to explain what we are accustomed to call "The Crisis in the University", but it proved to be extremely difficult to translate English ideas and arguments about university life into the background of Liège or Bonn or Aarhus; and a slight tendency to equate the model Christian university with, say Oxford with William Temple as Vice-Chancellor, suffered some rather heavy shocks. Our belief in a communal life of dons and undergraduates is not shared by all Continental intellectuals, and it was also refreshing to have some of our "liberal Christian" traditions of learning and politics questioned—not by communist but by *Christian* students—as being largely by-products of nineteenth-century history. The other major subject for discussion, a wholly commendable preoccupation of the conference, was the question of the students in Eastern Europe. How *can* a Christian student be faithful in Halle or Leipzig? And what of Warsaw or Prague to-day?

Probably too much was attempted, and too much of a common jargon and background taken for granted when the programme was drawn up. But nobody could see these young men from Germany, from France, and from the other occupied countries of Europe, calmly assuming that they should together work out a common Christian approach to their social problems, without being convinced that a multiplication of such courses would do a great deal to strengthen the Church in Europe.

The Ecumenical Institute

Among a number of interesting meetings held this year at the Ecumenical Institute at Bossey near Geneva, the work of the Conference on "Art and the Church" and the "Course for Missionaries" stand out. In both there was some plain speaking and some determined efforts at ecumenical agreement.

Unfortunately both the details of the reports and the delay in their publication indicate a serious overstraining of the Institute resources in the past few months. 1954, the year of Evanston, will obviously prove a difficult one for Bossey; and it is to be hoped that some more efficient system of publicity may be devised in the near future, even at some financial cost to the World Council of Churches. It is often very difficult for the Christian press to find out what work the Institute is doing, or what the various conferences have achieved. The work of the Institute is far too important for it to be handicapped in this way.

Church and Worker in France

The assembly of Cardinals and Archbishops in France has recently issued report on working class conditions. It contains a thorough examination of th psychological atmosphere of the class struggle, which it suggests is not so muc a doctrine to be argued about as a social fact. It indicates that many Frenc clergy show little response to social problems, and demands an intensification o social education for clergy and laity alike.

Such matters will clearly be much in the minds of the Church leaders who wer due to meet on 14th October to consider the future of priest workers in France with reference to the recent explicit orders from Rome to cease the training o ordinands as priest-workmen and the reported lack of recruits for the Missio de Paris in the last eigtheen months. Cardinal Feltin, Archbishop of Paris, in hi diocesan weekly has referred to the special dangers which priest-workmen face He declares that "they have more need of our prayers and our affection than o our criticism", and stresses again the urgent need to bridge the gap between th French church and the worker. It may be that the great experiment of Cardina Suhard and Abbe Godin has failed. If so, it is a terrifying failure. The Frenc workers are in a revolutionary mood, and it is a problem of the greatest urgenc and importance for the church to find some way of reaching them.

Preparations for Evanston, 1954

The Ecumenical Press Service, Geneva, reports that much attention has bee given to the task of bringing the issues of the Second Assembly of the Worl Council of Churches before the rank and file membership of the Churches, "i order that the Assembly itself may become, so far as possible, a conversatio between the Churches themselves, rather than merely among the 600 electe delegates". Accordingly the W.C.C. Study Department has issued a series o seven pamphlets on the main themes of the conference. It is distressing tha these publications, designed to arouse interest, study and prayer all over th Christian world, should be written to a large extent in ecumenical jargon whic obscures the tremendous importance of the subjects for discussion next yea The pamphlets should certainly prove effective in provoking discussion in theo logical colleges, but it is difficult to see how the ordinary Christian congregatio can be expected to study them with much profit. Is it not possible to issue som more popular and attractive material during the next few months?

Christian Personnel Management

The *Church and World* Institute of the Dutch Reformed Church at Driebergen Holland, has recently added two new courses on personnel management, one fo young students and a second for experienced industrial executives. This attemp to work out a specifically Christian approach to problems of personal relationship in industry has already gained the co-operation of important Dutch industrialists At the same time, *Church and World* has recently strengthened its links with th Dutch trade union world. The Dutch General T.U. (N.V.V.) has now appointe a special officer to study the problem, so familiar in Great Britain, of keepin higher union officials and the ordinary working members in contact with eac other. The man chosen was trained by *Church and World* Institute, which with the full approval of the union, is co-operating at every stage of the investigation

MARK GIBBS.

Moslems and Christians

Albert Hourani

The traditional relations of Christendom and Islam are changing faster than we adapt ourselves. A Christian of Arab descent shows some of the things which lie behind the decisive shift of power which is taking place in the Middle East.

It may seem strange that a Christian journal should publish an article about Islam; but it is not really strange, because Islam is one of the inescapable problems which Christians have to face. To take the matter at its most superficial level, that of political contacts: the facts of geography have in the last two centuries brought Western nations into intimate contact with the Moslem world. The Orthodox still look to Constantinople as their religious capital, and Constantinople is still under the Turks; the Balkans have long memories of Moslem domination; Russia's history has been deeply affected by the struggle with the Moslem peoples on the southern frontier; there are Christian minorities in a number of Moslem countries—Egypt and the Sudan, Syria, Jordan and Iraq; and there are two states, Albania and the Lebanon, which rest upon national co-operation between Moslems and Christians. Thus Islam is a fact which history has presented to Christendom and which still, in some sense, constitutes a challenge, towards which Christians must take up an attitude.

There are certain extreme attitudes which easily present themselves to us when we begin to think about the subject. There is the view of some old-fashioned missionaries who think of Moslems as violent and unreasonable animals, as a destructive sea constantly beating against the Eastern Churches, and who believe that all those Churches can do is to defend their positions, and that for this they need the help, political as well as intellectual, of the Western Powers, so that every Western withdrawal is a defeat for Christianity. But of those who think this we may ask: If Moslems are so fanatical, why is it that Christian Churches have been able to exist in Moslem countries for more than a thousand years? Again, is not a purely defensive Christianity a contradiction in terms?

At the other extreme is the attitude of those old-fashioned colonial officials who profess respect for the human virtues of Moslems and contempt for the lack of manliness and virtue in the Oriental Christians. Many Englishmen who have worked in the Middle East

tend to become pro-Moslem and anti-Christian, and in Africa administrators often say that Negroes converted to Islam acquire a new dignity and self-respect, while those converted to Christianity lose the social virtues they had. In this observation there may be some truth, and it is certainly right that we should give to Moslems the respect which we owe to all human beings. But clearly it cannot be a basis for a Christian attitude, for as Christians we cannot believe that Islam is superior to Christianity, or that it is essentially better for people to become or remain Moslems rather than Christians, or even that it does not matter humanly whether they are Moslems or Christians.

Thirdly, there is the directly and openly evangelical approach of those who wish to bear witness to Christ among the Moslems, not caring—in comparison with the fullness of revealed truth—what fragments of distorted truth may be embedded in Islam. Theirs is a true vocation and one in which we can all rejoice. We cannot be indifferent to the thought of Saint Francis preaching before the Sultan of Egypt. But it is not everybody's vocation, and the problems it raises are not precisely those which I want to deal with here. What I want to deal with is rather the relation between the Eastern Churches as they exist at present, and the Moslem community as it now exists, and as, humanly speaking, it seems likely to exist for a long time to come. (For the conversion of Moslems is in a way more difficult than that of anyone else, and that not only because the idea of the Incarnation seems to them incompatible with the great intuition of God's transcendence which lies at the heart of Islam, but also because of the strength of the ties which bind a Moslem to his community. For a Moslem to leave his community is to leave his whole world, and that is a sacrifice too great for all but the strongest. There are many educated Moslems, particularly those who have been educated in mission schools or in Western countries, who flirt with Christianity, but very few who take the leap in the dark. Most of them withdraw sooner or later, either into indifference or into some mystical form of Islam, such as that which has been worked out in our own days by the French convert René Guenon. Even if they do become Christian, it is only after terrible struggles of the will and feelings even more than of the intellect; and yet when the step is taken, the whole of Islam vanishes from their mind without remainder, and they bring to Christianity a simplicity and wholeheartedness which is all their own.)

Natural Religion

We can approach our problem from two points of view. First of all we must ask what is and what should be the attitude of individual Moslems and Christians towards the religion of the other.

Moslems believe that there is a natural religion stamped on our souls when we come into the world. We all of us know in our inmost hearts that God exists, the All-powerful, the Creator of the World, that it is our duty to obey His laws and testify to His existence, and that we shall in the end be held responsible and judged by God for our actions. But the world effaces these truths, and so God sends us prophets to call us back to them. There has been a whole line of prophets—Noah, Moses, Elijah, Job, Jesus, Mohammed—all saying essentially the same thing but sent primarily to different peoples. Some of these peoples have distorted the message given them; the Jews wished to keep their truth for themselves, while the Christians turned their prophet into a God. Therefore a final revelation was needed, and was given to Mohammed, the "seal of the prophets", who summed up and completed the distorted and partial truth of the others, and preached no longer to a single people but to the whole world.

Strictly, therefore, it is not possible for Islam to be opposed to the other monotheistic religions. In fact, Islam does not regard those other religions as essentially other than itself. It does not think of itself as one religion among many, but as *the* religion; and so a Moslem will be genuinely puzzled that Christians should attach so much importance to the things which divide them and should seem to ignore what unites them. But at the same time a Moslem may very easily take up a critical attitude towards Christians and Jews as people who have betrayed their prophets: not because they are not Moslems, but because they are not true Christians or Jews.

This is, so to speak, the official attitude of Islam towards the other religions, but behind it there can be detected another: a certain intellectual and spiritual dependence upon Christianity and Judaism. Throughout Islamic history Moslem thinkers have been peculiarly sensitive to Christian attacks on them, and indeed Moslem theology has largely grown up in response to these attacks; as MM. Gardet and Anawati have shown, while Christian theology is primarily an

attempt to develop and illuminate what is given in revelation. Moslem theology is primarily an attempt to defend what is given. More positively, Christian elements are deeply embedded in the thought and devotion of Islam. Moslems have a special veneration for Christ and for the Blessed Virgin, and in such mystics as Hallaj the figure of Christ has replaced that of Mohammed as the norm which moulds the inner life.

But this sense of dependence is not more than half conscious. For all but the deepest spirits of Islam it has been obscured by the fact that in Moslem popular thought truth has a direct relationship to success. Prophets may be persecuted when they first appear, but in the end they succeed in imposing their message upon the people to whom they are sent. A prophet who failed in the end would be a contradiction in terms; and it is not an accident that Moslems believe that Christ was not crucified, that he escaped and that Barabbas was crucified in his place. Thus the worldly glories of the Moslem Empire have played an important part in Moslem thought: a source of self-confidence so long as they existed, of consolation and longing now that they have vanished.

The Prophet

If this is what Moslems think of Christianity, what should Christians think of Islam? Any serious thought must start from a tension. On one hand, we cannot regard Mohammed as a prophet in the same sense as that in which Isaiah or Jeremiah were prophets, for the role of the Hebrew prophets was to point forward to the Incarnation, and the need for prophecy ceased once the event towards which it pointed had taken place. On the other hand, there are elements in the life of Mohammed which, to say the least, do not seem quite ordinary; and still more, there are elements in the developed spirituality of Islam which seem too noble to be a product of unaided human nature.

Reflecting upon these two facts, there are some who regard Islam as one of the greatest Christian heresies, still in its fall showing traces of its great original. There are others who think of it as a sort of evangelical preparation, a forerunner preaching the unity and power and justice of God in pagan Africa and pantheist Asia. These are only speculations. Perhaps we shall not know the truth of them until the end of the world. But they are useful if they help us to realise that Islam is something more than a fact of sociology or politics, and that somehow, in some way we cannot know, it is linked with the mysteries of the Church and of the Jews.

Assimilation and Separation

But Islam is not only a system of beliefs, it is also a community with a life of its own which has grown up through the ages and been moulded by the changes of history. Thus, when a Moslem thinks about Christianity or about the Eastern Christians, his ideas and feelings are partly determined by the whole history of the relations between his community and theirs. This is particularly important because Islam does not know the distinction between the spiritual and temporal realms. Throughout Islamic history, theological beliefs have embodied themselves in political movements and social attitudes, and what has happened in the political world has reacted immediately on the inner world of convictions.

When Islam burst out of the Arab peninsula into the Christian countries of the Eastern Empire, its expansion was made easier by the existence of theological and political divisions within the Churches and by previous Arab immigrations, so that a great part of Syria and Iraq at least was already dominated by the Christianized Arab tribes. It was comparatively easy for the Moslem conquerors to convert people (and the more so because at first it was not clear that Islam was a separate religion or more than a puritan reaction inside Christianity); it was easy, too, for them to reach a *modus vivendi* with those who remained Christians. Charters were given to the Christians in such towns as Damascus and Jerusalem, which surrended willingly, and in the course of time the status of Christians was codified and embodied in Moslem law. They had certain disabilities; for example they paid a special poll tax as the price of protection and they were not allowed to carry arms, or bear witness against Moslems, or wear certain colours. But within these limits they enjoyed a genuine toleration. They could worship as they pleased and live within their own communal organization and in accordance with their own religious law. At times they enjoyed great favour as officials, doctors and scholars, for the caliphs and sultans could not do without them. But gradually their situation worsened. This was partly because they were powerless in the hands of the Moslems who possessed political and military power. He who possesses power almost inevitably becomes arrogant, whether he is conscious of it or not; he who is deprived of power tends to lose his self-confidence and self-respect. This tendency was all the greater as the movement of conversion by the natural attraction of weakness towards strength overturned the numerical balance between Moslems and Christians; and also by the severing of the links between the

Eastern Churches and Western Christendom. This, in its turn, led to a weakening of their inner life and a tendency even for those who remained Christians to be assimilated socially and culturally to the dominant group. Coptic and Greek-speaking Christians adopted Arabic for their language, and such Moslem social customs as the wearing of the veil spread among the Christian communities. At the same time there was taking place a certain hardening in the spirit of Islam. Politically it was a reaction against the aggression of the Crusaders, but it went much deeper than this, and found expression in the development of a rigid scholasticism which put limits to the use of reason. It was balanced to some extent by the growth of mysticism, but as the mystical system of Islam grew up it lost the consciousness of Christianity. To the degree to which Moslems were touched by this system they withdrew into an inner world where deep contact with Christianity was lost.

The rise of the Turkish power and the construction of the Ottoman Empire gave a new lease of life to the Moslem domination of the Middle East. It was at first resented and opposed by the Christians. For example, the Maronite Patriarch of Lebanon sent a letter to the Pope asking him to preach a new Crusade to rescue the Eastern Christians from the unholy alliance of Turks and Jews. But in some ways the imposition of Turkish rule improved the position of the Christians. The Turks regularised and extended the rights of the Christian communities and the authority of their Patriarchs. These rights were really respected; Busbeckius, in the 16th century, notes the care with which the janissaries protected the Christian subjects of the Empire. Moreover, the Ottoman sultans, like their predecessors, could not do without the help of their subject peoples in administration, diplomacy and finance. At first they relied upon Jews and renegades, but from the 17th century they depended more and more upon the great Greek families of Constantinople.

Nationalism and Religion

In the last 150 years there has been a gradual change in the situation, which can be summed up by saying that the balance of social and political power in the Middle East has changed. First of all, the gradual establishment of European and American missions from the 17th century onwards enabled the Eastern Churches to re-establish contact with the Universal Church, and the mission schools helped them to a revival of their inner life—a revival which has been felt in the Orthodox Church as well as, although to a lesser extent than, in the Eastern Churches which accept the supremacy of

Rome. But on the whole this revival has taken place in a form which has separated the Eastern Christians, intellectually and socially, from the Moslems among whom they live; until recently the policy of the mission schools conduced to the spread of the French language and culture at the expense of Arabic and to the development of a social and political attachment to France.

Then, in the 19th century, there came a growth in the political and economic power of the West and the gradual imposition of Western domination over the Moslem world. Except for Turkey, this domination still exists, in an open or disguised form, throughout the Moslem countries. Its first effect was to give rise to a movement of panic and defensive pride among the Moslems, which in its turn easily gave rise to a special resentment against those Christian communities which had specially identified themselves with one or the other of the Western powers—the Catholics, who were under French influence, and the Orthodox and Armenians who had special links with Russia. The spread of Western ideas and the growth of Western power between them led to a revival in the corporate consciousness and will to live of the Middle Eastern communities. Since the communities were organised on a religious basis it was natural that in the first instance their revivals should take a religious form. Thus the Greek revolt of 1821 was not at first an attempt to set up an independent kingdom of Greece, but rather to overturn the religious balance in the Ottoman Empire. The Greek rebels called upon the Christians of the Empire to revolt and end the Moslem domination, and the repercussions were felt as far away as Jerusalem and Beyrut. It was only gradually that the different national divisions of the Christian communities asserted themselves, and the success of Greek nationalism led to separate nationalist movements among Rumanians, Bulgarians and Armenians. It was natural too that in the first instance the reaction of the dominant element to these movements should have taken an Islamic form: a revival of the unity and loyalty of the whole Islamic community. Here again, it took time before the Pan-Islamic movement split up into different national movements based upon language rather than religion, and this development is not complete and perhaps cannot be. Even in Turkey, for all the efforts of Kemal Ataturk to break with the traditions of the past, the identity of Turk and Moslem still exists and a Turkish Christian is almost a contradiction in terms. Among the Arabic-speaking peoples the situation is more complex because there exist large Christian groups which are deeply Arabised, if not Arab by origin, and which have indeed played a part in the revival of Arabic culture. In Egypt,

Syria and Jordan the Arabic-speaking Christians have largely identified themselves with the national movement; in Lebanon the largest Christian community, the Maronites, although Arab in culture, have a long tradition of separate political existence and attachment to France. It is only in the last few years that there has grown up the ideal of a Lebanon which, while co-operating with the other Arab countries, will preserve its separate existence, and which, while being a centre where Christian life can express itself in all the forms of society, also rests upon the hypothesis of Moslem-Christian equality.

The Future

The relation between Moslems and Christians as it exists to-day in the Middle East and as it may exist in the future, is the product of three forces. First, it depends and will depend upon the attitude of Western Christendom towards the Moslem world at every level, from that of political action to that of personal relations; for the Moslem world is still largely passive, still mainly reacts to what is done to it from outside. Secondly, it will depend upon the form which will be taken by the Islamic revival which we can see gathering force in the whole Moslem world from Morocco to Indonesia. Will that revival be a real deepening of the life of reason and devotion in Islam, or will it be a movement of barren defensive pride? Will it accept the idea of a certain separation between the spiritual and temporal spheres, of a realm in which adherents of different religions can co-operate on a level of equality for common natural ends? Thirdly, and perhaps most important, it will depend upon what happens to the Eastern Christians themselves. Will they be able to avoid the two extremes of shrinking into a defensive fear or of merging into a larger whole at the cost of denying or forgetting their own beliefs and traditions? Will they be able to reach that point of balance at which, while recovering their inner life and self-respect as Christians, they will yet be able and willing to co-operate on the natural level with their fellow citizens of other religions?

The Rebellion of Youth

Leslie Paul

Do we really understand the age we are living in? There can hardly have been an age so given as ours to the dissection of itself. The library shelves are chock full of volumes of analysis, the titles of which betray the rationalisations we are in process of making of our own history.

We have, at the same time, a certain expectation of the times; they are assumed to be living up to some laws of history we think we have discovered, or to be in process of working some pattern out. Thinking people at the beginning of this century had every reason to expect that our age would turn out to be an age of rational progress, extending to every sphere the advances in science and industry accomplished by the nineteenth century. And in some measure this has taken place. Yet the really original contribution of our age to history has not been the continuation of Victorian progress, but the irruption of barbarism and inhumanity. If we live in the century of the Welfare State, we live also in the century of the concentration camp, of slavery, of the systematic extermination of peoples. We debate the Welfare State, and take sides about it; whether we like it or dislike it. we understand it. We refuse to look at the other, because we do not know what to say about it.

We are face to face with the enigma of our times, once we think in these terms. And I'm going to speak about a small part of that enigma. For it is an important, if overlooked point, that there is in every age an inarticulate history; the history made by people who do not write their motives down in programmes, reports or statistics, but who simply, and with some stubbornness, live their lives as they wish. Let me illustrate this by an incident which has not found its way into the textbooks. In 1921, that year of post-war chaos, a youth, a veritable Pied Piper, appeared in Thuringia leading a "New Throng". His name was Muck-Lamberty. Take no thought for the morrow, he preached, throw everything up and strike into the blue. *Glut ist geist*, ardour is spirit, so let us dance and sing. Wherever his dancing band appeared, winding through the streets and filling the squares, the traffic and all other activities ceased. The citizens caught the madness too. The burghers left their shops and offices, the waiters the cafes, the factories came to a standstill, and everyone danced with the boys and girls in the streets. As a climax the young Messiah

addressed the crowds, saying that the harsh reality of their lives was nothing but appearance, true life began with dancing, so let them throw off the present and follow him. And they did. Delegations from towns and villages sought out Muck-Lamberty and entreated him to visit them. Police sent to the region to restore order were infected too, threw down their hats and capes, and joined in the dancing. Muck-Lamberty became a New Messiah, the Saviour of his people, and might have gone on from power to power had he not compromised himself by getting two girls simultaneously into trouble.

The Revolt from Tradition

Round about the beginning of this century a new self-consciousness began to grow among the very young. In Germany, some secondary schoolboys were so affected by an itch to wander, and to be different, that they formed themselves into little bands of self-styled vagrants who tramped through the countryside in strange costumes, singing to the music of lutes, or met secretly in huts in damp potato fields, after school. What were they after? They hardly knew themselves, except that they were stifled by the bourgeois life of their parents. In that guzzling life the young were not expected to be young, but miniature adults: the little boys wore "Fauntleroy" suits, with lace collars and cuffs, and long hair; or toy uniforms; the youths wore stiff shirts and hard collars or hats, the girls wore replicas of their mothers' dresses. Their social lives were modelled on adult pleasures—cards, calling, formal dances, over-eating, and so on.

The new vagrants hated this stupid life: they were appalled by its emptiness and lack of spirituality. They were against the successful materialism of the growing industrial society. The churches no longer provided them with an outlet because the churches were themselves corrupted by, and appeared defenceless before, scientific criticism. So—back to nature! It was a cult not unknown in Europe. It went back at least as far as Jean-Jacques Rousseau. It was fed at that time by Edward Carpenter in England, by Tolstoy in Russia, by many of the long-haired and besandalled seekers after the simpler life, who looked forward to a collapse of civilisation and a return to the primitive. But in Germany the romantic return was not confined to a few cranks and vegetarians. It became the mood of a whole generation. How typical the wandervögel were of their generation is shown by the rapid growth of youth leagues in Germany in the first twenty-five years of this century. No vital young fellow between the

ages of twelve and twenty-five could escape their influence in the years between the wars.

The crazy little wandering societies, which the schools authorities had tried to ban, set the way of life for all, even for the girls too. And one league of the young spoke for many when it declared: "We are united in our hatred of the institutions of this life and of this time. We ask ourselves: Who is to blame for this culture? The grown-ups! The task is to organise for the class-war of youth!" And the strange thing is that when Hitler appeared on the scene, he appeared as a youth movement type: bareheaded, with a long lock of hair falling over his face, a vegetarian, teetotaller, non-smoker, who was also an enthusiastic front-line soldier, and already using salutes, signs and titles which had their origin in youth groups. I am not going to say that the Youth Movements produced Hitler. That would be a falsification of history. But they were a part of the turning away from the European past which helped to produce the ethos in which Hitlerism could flourish. Even in its Christian expressions the German youth movement had a feeling for pagan things. And many a German boy grown to grey hairs has confessed that in his youth movement days he imbibed not only the ardour and warmth of his manly company, but a knowledge of the doctrine of Spengler that history was nothing more than a savage struggle in which tenderness, pity and humanity were mere weakness.

German youth movements, like the history of Germany itself, were rather a special case. But there was a "turning" in other parts of the world, too. Everywhere in the West, in fact, "the feet of the young men were turning" to the camps of proved delight. In America, about the end of the last century, a movement of Woodcraft Indians appeared among town youths. This movement, under the leadership of the naturalist, Ernest Thompson Seton, glorified the Red Indian culture destroyed by the White American, and sought to build up a system of training based on primitive stoicism. Seton wrote that "No world movement ever grew as a mere doctrine. It must have a noble exemplar". The exemplar he chose was the Red Indian of Fennimore Cooper and Longfellow. He could hardly find a good word to say for the white man.

The world movement of youth of which Seton dreamed was born, as it happened, soon after in Britain, and it was the creation of a soldier of genius, General Baden-Powell—or, to boys such as I was then—"B-P". "B-P" was moved by intensely patriotic motives to reclaim what he obviously thought of as the degenerate town boy.

And what he too promoted was a return to the primitive as the training ground for the boy—a return to woodcraft and scouting and an exaltation of the virtues of trappers and frontiersmen. British youth were just as stifled as German youth, and it was upon these propositions that they seized with a glorious enthusiasm, and almost before Baden-Powell had got the whole thing cut and dried, bands of boys of all classes appeared in the countryside, clad in slouch hats carrying broomsticks, wearing shorts, and putting into practice their own boyish rearrangement of "B-P's" order of educational priorities.

Letting in the Fresh Air

I would say then, taking my stand upon this evidence, that there has been a tremendous upsurge among the young during the first half of this century, and that this is indeed related to the barbarism of our times. But notice that I said related. I would not like to say that the youth movement, considered in its widest sense, was the barbarism, at least in the derogatory sense in which I have used the word. I know quite well what was in the minds of the youngsters who joined these leagues. They wanted to let some fresh air into the stuffy, upholstered way of life we had inherited from the Victorian era. They were bored by second-hand contacts with everything. They wanted to get at things for themselves. Because of the pace of change in life they had only contempt for the experience of their parents. As a result of this stirring, how completely they changed the whole way of life of the Anglo-Saxon nations! The love of nature, simpler and freer dress, the abolition of class distinction in clothes, less inhibited human relationships, more comradely relations with the other sex, the complete change in recreations and holidays—these can, by and large, be attributed to the influence of the youth movements. They are changes largely on the asset side. And if you can contrast an August crowd, or an August seaside today, with its counterpart fifty years ago you can see how great has been the social change. And if a social revolution is a revolution in the lives of people, rather than simply in the ownership of property, then the real revolution of our times is the rebellion of youth.

Many youth movements became, as I have indicated, strident and self-conscious. They developed a sense of mission, a sense of being "against". This was not true of the Scouts, obviously, but it was true of Seton's Indians, my own Woodcraft Folk, and many of the German youth groups. They felt that everything "old" had to be rejected, including, often enough, learning. Industrialism was inhuman, science

was thin and bloodless. It was not possible to live in that world of abstractions. But why were the young of *our* century so full of consciousness about themselves, and their own lack of roots? Undoubtedly because of the pace of change, and the extent of catastrophe. The world they inherited appeared immoral and uncontrollable. Wars and depressions increased their consciousness of its worthlessness. Very well, they said, we reject it, we will find our own way, "owning responsibility to no one". This was a good enough retort when it led to a fresher social life, or a determined search for fundamental beliefs, but full of danger when it led to a denial of the social and political morality which Europe had struggled so hard to preserve, or when it exalted (even if unconsciously) the savage, the primitive, the thinker with the blood, over St. Francis, or Beethoven, or Einstein, or when it threw away the Christianity which has been the life-stream of our civilisation in favour of half-hearted pagan practices in the pine-woods.

Britain and America easily contained and absorbed the movement of the young. But Germany did not. It was the young who made the standards there, in the end. And as a result of the turning away from all that has been dear to the West, a generation in Germany found itself spiritually empty. And into that emptiness Hitler and his dark angels rushed irresistibly, and a whole German generation found itself possessed.

Freedom and Order in France and England

J. P. Mayer

The Editor of de Tocqueville, who is equally at home in both countries, analyses some of the values which underlie French and British politics.

In book IX, chapter 2, of Montesquieu's *De l'Esprit des Lois*, we read the significant sentence: "No word has meant so many different things and struck human minds in so many different ways as the word 'liberty' ". One cannot say that Montesquieu's profound observation has become a commonplace, for at the bottom of many of our contemporary political conflicts and misunderstandings is the basic difference in which the term "liberty" is applied. Even between ourselves and our neighbours beyond the Channel, there seems to be little agreement about this fundamental political concept. Whereas

freedom in Great Britain seems to imply freedom within a disciplined social order, the French concept of freedom has—as seen from Great Britain—an anarchic touch: the French meaning of freedom is the freedom of an individual who does not readily accept the order of a state structure. The French individual maintains himself *versus* the State—except in times of crisis. It is this anarchic tendency which gives the French political mind its spiritual wealth and restlessness, whereas the British concept of freedom as freedom within an order gives the Englishman his typified character. In other words, as compared with the Frenchman, the Englishman in politics is (at his best) always the realisation of a type.

It is difficult to offer a satisfactory sociological explanation of this fundamental difference. I would suggest that the difference between the political structure of our two nations can only be found in history.

Two points should perhaps be stressed here: first, the different religious development in France and Great Britain during the Middle Ages. A great French historian, Petit-Dutaillis, has seen this difference with the utmost clarity: "The fact that the English Church participated in the struggle against the King gave that struggle a fairly exalted, constitutional character . . . In France, on the other hand, the alliance between Royalty and Church was not broken".

Church or Market-place?

Whereas the peculiar attitude of the mediaeval Church in England gave the British body politic throughout the centuries its "organic" character, the collaboration between Royalty and Church in France led, particularly from 1789 onwards, to a fundamental antagonism within French society, an antagonism which has lost nothing of its danger and virulence. In England the whole fabric of social life became embedded in a religious atmosphere. This tendency persisted through the victory of Nonconformity to nearly our own time: Churchill, Cripps, Attlee, are bearers of this politico-religious tradition. It is here, I believe, that the peculiar tolerant character of British politics has to be sought. I am writing these brief observations in a country house in a little village near Windsor whose name you find already in the *Domesday Book*: in the archives of our little village church you will find records going back to the 13th and 14th centuries which show that the village church served then as a meeting-place of the secular village parish. At such meetings the altar was covered

by a draping. But you still discussed your secular affairs in the presence of God. Is this not an explanation of the subdued tone of our political discussions? In France, however, such meetings took place outside the church, where no similar restraint had to be observed. I have often wondered whether this fact does not explain the market-place character of French political discussions.

I should perhaps add another historical fact which is not always present in people's minds. When in the 14th century the House of Commons moved into the Chapel of Westminster, a similar adaptation took place. The Commons who took possession of St. Stephen's "did not find an empty building as in a chapter house or hall, to be fitted up as required, but a college chapel complete with the fittings of stalls, a screen, and an ante-chapel, as has been explained. We know what they did with these fittings. They put the Speaker's Chair in front of the altar, and the members sat down in the stalls. The lectern in the middle of the Choir gave place to a table on which was laid the Speaker's Mace, and at which the Clerks of the House sat. The return-stalls with their backs to the screen became 'cross benches'; and, by making a 'Bar of the House' in front of these, those who sat (as they sit to-day) in the cross benches were technically outside the House.

> "The ante-chapel became, by a simple alteration in name only, 'The Lobby of the House of Commons', and it was easy to tell the votes as the members passed out of the chapel into the ante-chapel, by letting the 'Ayes' walk out on one side of the double door, and the 'Noes' on the other. All such procedure was found for the House of Commons in the Chapel of St. Stephen; and to this day, whatever alterations may appear to have taken place, it may be said that the members are still sitting in a college chapel. In the nineteenth century Barry, in all essentials, followed the same arrangement; and the new chamber is based on the one he designed. The tradition of St. Stephen's College Chapel has not been broken". (Maurice Hastings, *Parliament House,* London, 1950, p. 79 ff.)

It is well known that when a member enters the Chamber he bows before the Speaker, but it is less well known that the Speaker, when he enters the Chamber at 2.30 in the afternoon, bows also. Does he bow before the symbol of his office? It is unlikely; he bows because 600 years ago, on the same spot where now the Speaker's chair stands, stood the altar.

Tradition gives British political discussion its depth, or perhaps better, its living totality. It is this traditional character which makes Edmund Burke the British philosopher *par excellence*, and we only need to remind ourselves of his polemics with the *philosophes* of the French Enlightenment to have the striking contrast between French

and British political reason before us. "Liberty", writes Burke "must be limited in order to be possessed. The degree of restraint it is impossible in any case to settle precisely. But it ought to be the constant aim of every wise counsel to find out by cautious experiments, and rational, cool endeavours, with how little, not how much of this restraint, the community can subsist. For liberty is a good to be improved, and not an evil to be lessened."

Compare with this Rousseau's famous chapter VIII of the second book of the Contrat Social: ". . . for it (the people) can make itself free only as long as it is in a state of barbarism, but it cannot do this once society has lost its elasticity. Then unrest may destroy it without revolutions being able to restore it; and as soon as its fetters are broken, it falls to pieces and ceases to exist; henceforth it will need a master and not a liberator".

Parliamentary Procedure

One could, perhaps, also mention the significant difference between the history of French and British parliamentary procedure. Whereas the former begins only in 1789, the latter is at the end of the 16th century already fully developed. In Sir Thomas Smith's *De Republica Anglorum* (first edition 1581) we recognize all the characteristic later features of British Parliamentary procedure. I cannot resist quoting a few striking sentences:—

> "No reviling or nipping words must be used. For then all the house will cry, it is against the order: and if any speak unreverently or seditiously against the Prince or the privy Council, I have seen them not only interrupted, but it hath been moved after to the House, and they have sent them to the Tower. So that in such a multitude and in such diversitie of minds, and opinions, there is the greatest modesty and temperance of speech that can be used. Neverthelesse, with much doulce and gentle terms, they make their reasons as violent and as vehement the one against the other as they may ordinarily, except it be for urgent causes, and hasting of time."

The other decisive structural difference in the sociological make up between France and England must probably be seen in the relative absence of Roman influence on Great Britain.

In contrast, France has been thoroughly Romanised. In England the state structure has always maintained its local government origins. To quote M. Siegfried: "The power of the state is conceived as separate from and exterior to the individual, possibly even dangerous to him, a power considered as the ancient races considered god. One can lay hold of the state in order to acquire domination, the *imperium* of the Romans, but at the same time it may be prudent

to shield oneself against it, since the state, in the hands of one's antagonists, is apt to abuse its power. There is a striking difference here from the Anglo-American idea of the state as a protective, community delegation of powers. The latter conception is in line with the Protestant tradition, while the French point of view bears a relation to the Roman Catholic concept of authority: the hierarchy of the Church stands outside and above the individual."

The Roman tradition in France has, of course, many other aspects. The family, for instance, is in France stronger than the State; nor should we omit to stress the impact of Roman law on the French political mind. I would not be surprised if the *Vereinsrecht* (the Continental law of Association), which does not exist in England, explains the French multiple party system, whereas the absence of it in England favours large parties. Yet the instability of the French governmental structure, however fateful for world politics, is a result of the strength of the French national character, not of its weakness.

It is noteworthy in this context that many of the French political philosophers have attempted to transplant British political principles into French soil. Whereas Bodin regarded British Government as a "mixed" type which could not stand up to a comparison with the monarchical principle he had chosen as his ideal, we see that from 1689 onwards the influence of British political thought gains an ever-increasing influence on French political opinion. The anti-absolutist movement in England served as a catalyst in France. Voltaire and Montesquieu completed this process during the 18th century. With Mirabeau's vain attempt to introduce the rules of British parliamentary procedure into the Assemblée Nationale, a counter movement begins which was, however, successfully broken by a generation led by Madame de Stael and Chateaubriand. The following generation: Charles de Remusat, Gustave de Beaumont, Duvergier de Hauranne, and, above all, Tocqueville, revitalized the lessons of Montesquieu for *their* century. Yet their action and thought could not take root in France. The French Revolutionary tradition remained unaffected.

What are the lessons to be learnt from our differences? First it seems that we must know that we *are* different, and *why* we are different: liberty has a different meaning beyond the Channel. Only if we understand our different ways of life, can we undertake common tasks; such collaboration in functional tasks has in recent years very often suffered from the wrong presupposition that freedom or democracy in France has the same meaning as in Great Britain.

Book Reviews

Refusal to Hate

Return to Goli. By Peter Abrahams. (Faber & Faber. 12s. 6d.)

Among many books of many kinds written lately about Southern Africa, Mr. Abraham's account of his visit last year to Kenya and the Union is remarkable in two respects. First, because Mr. Abrahams is a coloured South African who was born in Johannesburg but who has lived for the last fourteen years in Europe, and has thus experienced both the normal English life of personal freedom and the bitter frustrating existence of a non-white under a colour bar. He can take as it were simultaneously both the inner and the outer view of the problems of a plural society. Secondly, it is remarkable in that Mr. Abrahams does not allow himself to hate. Others have described what he describes: the slums in the big cities, the appalling contract system of farm labour, the inhuman life on the mines, the desolate poverty of the reserves, the tension and unhappiness that grips both black and white; but Mr. Abrahams, a creative writer who sees "with the long eye of history", reports on what he sees with love and anger, and with an objective humanity. Yet, in writing for the immediacy of the newspapers (Mr. Abrahams' journey was sponsored by *The Observer*) it is sometimes difficult to focus that eye far enough or deep enough. For the South African situation seems to have the terrible momentum of tragedy, the protagonists being propelled along the paths of disaster, committing one mistake after another, either through cynicism, ignorance or malice. Mr. Abrahams warns the whites in Africa that change is inevitable, and that the Africans are determined to be free, and he fears that a black-white conflict would result in the total destruction of the whites, and, for the blacks, in a hatred of all whites of whatever nationality. Not only that, but that the black man, in order to be free, might fight against democracy, and so doing, destroy it. But his way out of this dilemma, even if it were practicable, might turn out to be simply an added complication. "I would favour United Nations occupation, which would mean the eradication of the myth of racial superiority without the tragic implications of a bitter civil war and all that would come in its train". But would it?

There can be no solution of the problem of Southern Africa which does not take into account the character of the white South African of Dutch descent—the Afrikaner. Mr. Abrahams romanticises the Great Trek. Certainly the trekkers showed immense courage and endurance, but their motive in leaving the Cape was not so much love of freedom as dislike of and impatience with the law. This determination by each man that he should be a law unto himself is one of the foundations of South African fascism, and in the past has been the reason why time and time again the trekkers proved incapable of governing themselves. The descendants of these men, among whom are to be found both the noblest liberals and the most cynical fascists, now rule South Africa, but they still have to learn how to live as part of a true community. The Afrikaner writes and speaks about himself and his myth more than does the English-speaking South African, and it is this, I think, that has led Mr. Abrahams to consider that the Afrikaner alone has the true love of Africa: "Like the Blacks, the Afrikaans-speaking Whites had made that mystical compact with the soil and are Natives of the Earth". But

men who have not yet learned to forget hatred and tolerate fellow-citizens of a different nationality will not easily give up their assumed superiority over the black man. Up till now in South Africa the black man has been more generous than the white, but who can blame him if he is becoming, in Mr. Abrahams' words, "the psychological pit-pony of our time".

Mr. Abrahams gives a small brilliant sketch of Kenyatta, the lonely and embittered intellectual "too proud to accept the friendship of whites on terms other than those of complete equality".

Writing about the colour bar in Kenya Mr. Abrahams concludes: "I confess that, if I were a Kenya African, I would be as bitter as Kenyatta against the general White attitude that the only co-operation possible is on their terms, with its tacit assumption that my position must always be that of a social, political and economic inferior. Like them, I would say: 'This partnership is a fraud' ".

In an epilogue Mr. Abrahams finds hope in the gesture of a few white South Africans who openly identified themselves with the non-white campaign of defiance. This action has been condemned by other whites as dangerous and politically inept. It has perhaps achieved nothing, but, in the long view of history, it is morally necessary that this gesture should have been made. Mr. Abrahams' book may achieve nothing either, but his refusal to fall back into hate and bitterness is a very magnificent and necessary gesture.

MARRIS MURRAY.

Violet Markham

Return Passage. The Autobiography of Violet R. Markham, C.H. (Oxford University Press. 21s.)

Violet Markham has lived at the centre of the life of her time. Gifted with a genius for friendship, she became the close friend of many of the men and women who played a leading part in the history of the first half of this century — Dr. Thomas Jones, for example, for many years deputy secretary to the Cabinet, to whom she dedicates her autobiography, and of whom she writes, in words which others who know him would endorse, that he has been "the keeper of the consciences of more persons and the holder of more secrets, private and public, than any other individual in the land". Among a host of other intimate friends were the first Earl of Cromer, John Buchan, Leo Amery, Mackenzie King (Prime Minister of Canada), Lord Rushcliffe, Sir Robert Morant, Sir Arthur Salter, Sir Hector Hetherington, Miss May Tennant, Canon and Mrs. Hensley Henson and Dean and Kitty Inge. She has herself taken an active part in public affairs. She founded a Social Settlement in Chesterfield, became the first woman mayor of that town, served for more than a quarter of a century on the Industrial Court, has been a member of many government committees and trade boards, and a member of the National Assistance Board from its foundation in 1934, and for ten years its deputy chairman. She has travelled widely, becoming acquainted with Egypt in her early twenties, paying a number of visits to South Africa, about which she has written two books, making a prolonged tour of China, Japan and the Dutch East Indies, and making a visit also to South America. She can say with Ulysses, "Much have I seen and known: cities of men and manners, climates, councils, governments".

The granddaughter of Joseph Paxton, whose life she wrote, she was born and brought up in a circle of wealthy iron-

masters and coal-owners. She was powerfully influenced in her youth by her mother, a woman of wide intellectual interests and possessing in a high degree the Christian virtues, but unable to accept traditional religious beliefs. Two blanks in her education were that she was taught neither the Bible nor Shakespeare. Shakespeare was for many years a dead letter to her until one day the curtain was parted, and "suddenly the whole content of life was changed". Growing up as "an active agnostic with a haughty contempt for creeds and parsons", she was persuaded when she was nearly thirty to go to a service at St. Margaret's, Westminster, and at once came under the spell of Canon Hensley Henson's preaching. He expounded what she felt to be a reasonable faith which could be accepted without the sacrifice of intellectual integrity. She became, and has remained since, a convinced Christian. The last chapter of her book is a confession of her faith, as it has been formed and tested by her wide experience of life.

Miss Markham writes in an attitude of singular detachment. She is often tantalisingly reticent about her own achievements. What she is interested in is not herself but the world in which she has lived.

The book can be read with unflagging interest. It is full of shrewd observation and mature wisdom. Yet in spite of all this, when I reached the end, there mingled with my immense admiration for the writer and for her story a vague sense of something missing. It arose, as I realized on reflection, partly from the knowledge that the world of which she gives so vivid a picture, and in which, at a greater distance from the centre, my own life was passed, has vanished never to return. But I feel also that Miss Markham, just because she was so integrally a part of it, is not critical enough, perhaps, of its shortcomings. She certainly saw with more than usual clarity some of its evils, and set herself with abounding energy to combat them. But she is a little apt to judge the world in which she lived and worked by its own best standards and shows too little awareness of the limitations of its outlook. The world in which the younger generation have to live and find their bearings is a very different one from that to which she gave splendid service, but it is certain that that generation will be equal to the tasks which confront it only if it can produce women and men possessing the integrity, strength of purpose, energy, public spirit and courageous faith of Violet Markham.

J. H. OLDHAM.

Children and Negroes

The Teacher Was Black. By H. E. O. James and Cora Tenn. (Heinemann. 10s. 6d.)

"The wolf and the lamb shall lie down together . . . and a little child shall lead them." And perhaps it is when the all-wise adult does, in fact, allow the child to lead him that we most truly draw near to the delectable state in which racial wolves and lambs will consent to lie amicably down together.

The Teacher Was Black is the record of an experiment on the effects of particular race contacts upon the attitude of children to other races in general. Fifty-seven children played their part in the experiment, and the findings, analysed with meticulous care, bring out some important points both for those concerned with fostering right relationships between the nations, and for teachers of all nationalities. Teachers of geography in particular will find a challenge in the contention that frequently in teaching the subject "The

emphasis on people (is) too slight compared with the emphasis on things, and often too much on differences and too little on the fundamental similarities between peoples".

RUTH L. DOUGLASS.

A Christian Judge

The Changing Law. By Sir Alfred Denning. (Stevens & Sons. 10s.)

The law of a nation is not a systematic deduction from a series of *a priori* first principles. It is a matter of growth. The law must constantly be adapted to social changes. This adaption is achieved partly by statute and partly by judicial decisions. In respect of the latter Lord Justice Denning quotes with relative approval the dictum of a recent Attorney General that it is "a most important principle of our constitutional practice that judges do not comment on the policy of parliament, but administer the law, good or bad, as they find it". But a statute by careless draftsmanship or through social changes may work out unjustly in practice, contrary to the intention of parliament. In administering such a law the judge, in the writer's view, may properly call attention to its defects. Moreover, the administration of the law involves the interpretation of the law and this book shows in a very interesting way how "in our days, as in former days, the substantive law is often to be found secreted in the interstices of legal procedure". The changes in the doctrine of Mistake are taken by the author to indicate, too. how there may constantly be an infusion of equity into the traditional interpretation of the law.

The writer does not in this book refer explicitly to the principle of "public policy", but he would presumably agree with Oliver Wendell Holmes that considerations of public policy give life to the law, except only that he is much more decisively Christian than was the great American judge. He would, too, have much sympathy, one imagines, with the Sociological School of Jurisprudence, which regards the history of law as the record of a species of social tinkering (except, again, that Lord Justice Denning has a clear and positive conception of the type of social order at which we should aim). He believes in justice and liberty, which he conceives to be basic aims of the British Constitution. We all know, more or less, what we mean by justice: it is, perhaps, no fair criticism upon a book of this brevity that the author fails to indicate how far from clear is the concept of liberty. There is, again, an ambiguity when the writer speaks of the peculiar genius of the British Constitution as lying in three "instincts"; this inexact word hides more than it reveals. Sometimes the writer makes his escape quite frankly: "I offer no solution except to suggest that true Christianity should try to strike a balance between the individual and the society of which he forms a part"; but he may be forgiven, since he is writing a book about jurisprudence, not about philosophy! He has no doubt at all that the end of the law is justice, an ethical ideal; he thinks that the severance of law from morality and religion has gone much too far; "if the people have not true religion, then all the ordinances of the law are of little use"; but when he asserts that the *mens rea* or guilty mind involves "sin", he has somewhat awkwardly introduced a theological or religious concept into a legal question.

NATHANIEL MICKLEM.

New Books on Russia

Russia After Stalin. By Isaac Deutscher. (Hamish Hamilton. 10s. 6d.)
Listen Comrades. By El Campesino. (Heinemann. 15s.)
Unwilling Journey. By Helmut Gollwitzer. (SCM Press. 16s.)

A few days after Stalin's death Mr. Isaac Deutscher began to write his book about Russia after Stalin. A Marxist, though not a Stalinist, he believes that the future course of political evolution can be deduced from the state of a society at any moment. Great men are produced by the opportunities of history, not vice versa. Trotsky, according to a letter found by Mr. Deutscher in the Trotsky archives, did not agree; in his view "without Lenin the October Revolution would not have been won". We may agree with Trotsky, but Mr. Deutscher argues with subtlety. In his view, Stalin outlived his historical role and even before he died the stage was set for a "democratization" of the Stalinist system. I, too, have argued in these columns that Stalinism will in the end turn into something else. This prospect does not seem so near or so clear to me as it does to Mr. Deutscher. But his boldness makes his book all the more stimulating and his great knowledge of Russia entitles him to his guesses.

El Campesino, the famous general of the Spanish civil war, portrays himself as a brave, cruel, dashing man who is almost more at home among gangsters than in political discussions. His simple, cast-iron faith in Communism was slowly broken by life in Soviet Russia. His attempts to escape from Soviet Russia succeeded in the end, but not before he had gone through a fearful variety of prisons and concentration camps and learnt to be at home in the Soviet underworld—he lived for some time as a bandit in Russian Turkestan. The strictness of Soviet rule seems to have created a vast underworld of those who live by outwitting the regime; one hears very little about this very tough but very human society, which is within the Soviet Union but outside ordinary Soviet life, and one would like to have more about it from El Campesino.

His prison life shows, alas, that the obvious gaps in the older technique of mental cruelty have now been closed. In the terror of 1937-8 there was a strange freedom of the prison cell, where the prisoners talked away very openly between interrogations. Now prisoners can share the same cell without even learning who each other are. During the day El Campesino and his cell mates "had to sit on our uncomfortable bunks in an upright position, our legs and knees close together . . . never for a moment allowing ourselves to relax or slump. Each had a book in his hands and longed to read, but the regulation demanded that he kept his eyes fixed on the peep-hole in the door. If one of us forgot himself . . . the door would open almost immediately and the guard would call him to order with blows".

Behind the peep-hole in the door the prisoners saw, or thought they saw, "the eye of the guard unceasingly fixed on us . . . We saw it day and night, awake and asleep. All our nightmares centred on the peep-hole and the eye".

Helmut Gollwitzer is professor of theology at Bonn. He was a prisoner of war in Russia and his reminiscences are now translated into English. It is clear that he saw a very different side of life from El Campesino. He gives the Soviet prison guards and doctors a fairly good character. "To let us live as human beings . . . that was the aim of the Soviet Government. This was the difference from the German

FABER BOOKS

The Transcendent Unity of Religions

FRITHJOF SCHUON

This comparative and synthetic study of Oriental and Occidental religion, translated from the French, introduces English readers to the work of a writer of great erudition and intellectual concentration. 21*s*

St. Teresa of Jesus E. ALISON PEERS

Essays and addresses on Spanish mysticism and literature, mainly devoted to the work and letters of St. Teresa and St. John of the Cross. "Though not composed expressly for the purpose, this excellent book would serve as an introduction enabling the reader to savour and appreciate the charming culture of Spain."—*Irish Independent.* 25*s*.

concentration camps . . . The cruelty of Sovietism is a bloodless cruelty. Its scorn of men is not cynical but Utopian; scorn of the present-day man as a prehistoric being compared with the man of the future who will be the true man".

It is all true. The incredible variety of Russian life can never be put in one book.

J. W. L.

Obedient Fools?

The Making of a Moron. By Niall Brennan. (Sheed & Ward. 10s. 6d.)

This work has its genesis in the circumstance that in the 1914-18 war mental defectives were drafted, as an experiment, into industry, and proved themselves, so the blurb and the author tell us, more easily disciplined, more content with their mechanised tasks, and even more efficient than normal men or women. However this may be, the scientific note upon which the book opens is soon abandoned in favour of a vigorous condemnation of modern industrial methods. The word "moron" turns out to be simply an epithet for someone whose ideas or way of life you do not happen to approve. To Mr. Brennan "the labourer is a potential moron, the millionaire is an actual moron". But moron means "mental defective", and as a rule neither labourers nor millionaires are mental defectives. It is dangerous to label any class or group sub-human, when probably you mean morally blunted.

But forget the pseudo-science, and how good it all is—the accounts of the crass stupidities of the industrial chiefs, foreman and shop-walkers, the odd bits of autobiography of an eccentric.

CHURCHMAN'S No.1

the 15-minute cigarette

W. A. & A. C. CHURCHMAN

Founded in Ipswich in the year 1790

Branch of The Imperial Tobacco Co. (of Great Britain & Ireland), Ltd.

C.M.4

Mirror to Everyman

Publish and Be Damned! By Hugh Cudlipp. (Dakers. 292 pp. 12s. 6d.)

Why should everybody spend more than five minutes a day on politics? Somebody must boil the news down to its essentials for non-political man. We need tabloid papers. And thank goodness there's no cant about the *Daily Mirror*. So said I to myself as I opened *Publish and Be Damned!* But I was wrong. The official biographer of the *Daily Mirror* moralises unblushingly about the high aims of sensational journalism.

The *Mirror* is well named. It reflects every facet of common humanity. It is not true that it prospers by exploiting mainly the lower side of human nature, as certain other publications do. The men who run the *Mirror* are clever enough to see that sales can often be raised by an appeal to the good side of human nature. The *Mirror* is all things to all men. And that includes a readiness to be a prig with the priggish.

Just occasionally the *Daily Mirror* raises you a tiny bit above the ordinary level. You like that. It is good for sales and there are some secret idealists on the staff always waiting for their chance. The *Mirror* was one of the first papers to publish a really penetrating article about the Mau Mau. And Mary Brown is always on the side of the angels; the public demands that.

The visitors to my house snort when they see the editor of the CHRISTIAN NEWS-LETTER reading the *Daily Mirror*, but I cannot get *Publish and Be Damned!* out of their hands. There is not a dull page or a dull picture in the book. One cannot forget the incredibly vital faces of the men who have made the *Mirror* and are making it now. Northcliffe, Kenealy, Rothermere, Bartholomew and now the powerful, inscrutable Mr. Cecil King who doesn't believe in principles. Or does he? Mr. Cudlipp has pulled no punches in portraying his chief.

J. W. L.

Salvation from Devil's Island

The Conquest of Devil's Island. By Charles Péan. (Max Parrish, 10s. 6d.)

This is a relatively unvarnished account of the work of the Salvation Army in French Guiana written by the officer who pioneered the way. It is in some ways more terrible than the accounts of prison life in Siberia or Nazi Germany. The floggings described by Dostoevsky in his prison reminiscences seem at times less cruel than the sort of administrative absent-mindedness which without quite knowing what it was doing condemned men to confinement for life in a climate far more deadly than Siberia. The absence of supervision was even more depraving than the hardest prison rules.

The Salvation Army were almost the only Christians to undertake effective work in French Guiana. They went to preach the Gospel, but to do this effectively they were obliged to undertake what would now be called Frontier work, organizing a profitable plantation and workshops. And thanks to this work the Penal Settlement in French Guiana no longer exists.

J. W. L.

The Oldest South Africa

The Fire-Raisers. By Marris Murray. (Secker and Warburg. 12s. 6d.)

South Africa resembles one of its own diamonds; turn it a little and the light falls on yet one more facet of the stone. In this book we are shown a new side of life in the country, that of a farming valley in the Western Province. It is a story ably and gently told by an author who has first-hand experience of that community and who feels its atmosphere intensely.

The setting is one of an older European civilization than the rest of South Africa, going back 300 to 400 years, and with a coastal climate different from the rest of the country, wet in winter and with dry windy summers, the temperate zone of the vineyard, the olive, and the aromatic plants. It is in the spell of tremendous scenery, with its deceptive air of graciousness and peace, that the story is played out. South Africa has so often been pictured as a land of milk and honey; it is well that this book corrects such an impression.

With a sure hand Miss Murray portrays the valley and its old plural society, recently invaded from the hinterland by the Bantu boys and girls in search of work. Her delineation of the coloured family, the Kleinstukkies, is both unforced and masterly. The personalities of Jacob and Etienne are a fine achievement for a first novel, and give one confidence in her future as a writer. Agatha, with her faint tinge of coloured blood, is shadowy, but also more integrated, more mature as a personality. The effect on their lives of the tightening up of the morality laws, with the ban on mixed marriages, introduced by the Nationalist Government, is shown in its most cruel form in the problems of Agatha, for it is to the sensitive "borderline" cases that tragedy comes. Their position is seen in its starkness when Etienne talks of going north to Rhodesia, "at least we can get married there", and is made more poignant by Agatha's answer: "Do you think black Africa will want us when white does not?"

For Christians, this book provides matter for deep reflection—the engulfment of the innocent in the fire, the childish ignorance and thoughtlessness of the fire-raisers themselves, the mounting horror of petty cruelties and the bewilderment of the staunch.

ELIZABETH FEILING.

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

A. S. CRAN.—Vicar of Congresbury, Somerset.
RUTH L. DOUGLASS.—Overseas Education Secretary of the Church Missionary Society.
ELIZABETH FEILING.—Has worked for eight years in South Africa, including experience in the mission field with the Cowley Fathers.
MARK GIBBS.—Assistant Editor of the CHRISTIAN NEWS-LETTER, Senior History Master, Audenshaw Grammar School, Manchester.
ALBERT HOURANI.—Fellow of Magdalen College, Oxford.
A. C. MACINTYRE.—Assistant Lecturer in the Philosophy of Religion, University of Manchester.
Dr. NATHANIEL MICKLEM.—Principal of Mansfield College 1932-53, author of *Law and the Laws*, son of Nathaniel Micklem, Q.C.
MARRIS MURRAY.—South African author and journalist.
Dr. J. H. OLDHAM.—Life-long worker for the Ecumenical Movement, Editor of the CHRISTIAN NEWS-LETTER 1939-43.
LESLIE PAUL.—Founder of the "Woodcraft Folk", author of *Angry Young Man.*

The Editors will welcome and will always acknowledge letters on the contents and policy of the CHRISTIAN NEWS-LETTER.